

REMARKS

Claims 17-30 and 41-43 remain in the application. Claim 17-30 and 41-43 are rejected. Claim 17 has been amended. The applicant believes the amendment does not introduce new matter and is at least supported in Fig. 3 and Fig. 5A.

Interview Summary

Applicant and Examiner discussed the Acres reference. Examiner said he will consider modifying the "an output communication port" to be more reflective of only one output communication port being claimed in the claimed invention.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 17-19, 21-30 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being anticipated by Acres et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5, 741, 183). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

All of the instant claims as amended, 17-30 and 41-43 describe a communication multiplexer device with a plurality of communication ports, only one output communication port and a logic device. The communication multiplexer device is connected to a master gaming controller on a gaming machine and one or more game service servers and receives communications from both the one or more game servers and the master gaming controller via the plurality of communication ports and the output communication port. The communication multiplexer device controls communications between the plurality of communication ports and the only one output communication port. Further, the logic device on the communication multiplexer device does not directly communicate with the master gaming controller on the gaming machine.

In contrast, Acres describes a device that directly communicates with the master gaming controller and a network.

The network interface 49 of the data communication node 42 is also coupled to the personality board by a bus 222, as shown in FIG. 2. Bus 222 includes four conductors which connects the four terminals of connector 51 with four corresponding terminals of connector 204, as indicated by the common lettered suffixes. It is over these four lines that the DCN controller 46 indirectly communicates with the floor controller (Col. 18, 1-8).

Thus, Acres teaches communicating using four lines while the present invention teaches "only one output communication port." For at least these reasons, Acres cannot be said to anticipate or render obvious claims 17-19, 21-30 and 41-43 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

The Examiner rejected claims 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Acres in view of Alcorn et al (U.S. patent No. 6,149, 522). The rejection is respectfully traversed.


The Examiner rejected claims 43 under as being unpatentable over Acres in view of O'Toole (U.S. Patent 6,345, 294).

All of the instant claims as amended, 17-30 and 41-43 describe a communication multiplexer device with a plurality of communication ports, only one output communication port and a logic device. The communication multiplexer device is connected to a master gaming controller on a gaming machine and one or more game service servers and receives communications from both the one or more game servers and the master gaming controller via the plurality of communication ports and the only one output communication port. The communication multiplexer device controls communications between the plurality of communication ports and the only one output communication port. Further, the logic device on the communication multiplexer device does not directly communicate with the master gaming controller on the gaming machine. The structure and function described in the limitations of claims 17-30 and 41-43 are not described in the combination of references or individual references cited by the examiner.

The Examiner relies on Alcorn for methods relating to casino security and O'toole for methods relating to a boot server. Thus, the combinations of Alcorn and Acres or O'toole do not remedy the deficiencies in Acres in regards to only one output communication port and in regards to directly communicating with the master gaming controller. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Acres, Alcorn and O'toole, alone or in combination, can't be said to render obvious claims 17-30 and 41-43 and the rejection of claims 20 and 43 are believed overcome thereby.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



David P. Olynick
Reg. No.: 48,615

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
510-843-6200

Application No. 09/690,925
Reply to office Action of May 5, 2004

11